

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9-13, 15, 16, 19, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent Number 6,714,952 to Dunham et al. (hereinafter “Dunham”). Claims 7 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunham in view of Derek Gamradt, “Backup without disruption: LAN-free, server-free SAN backup avoids disrupting business” (hereinafter “Gamradt”).

Applicants thank the Examiner for the telephone interview of February 22, 2007. In the interview we discussed proposed amendments including the limitations of a status for processed data portions and restoring data over a plurality of sessions. The Examiner suggested further amendments directed to blocking access according to the status and multiple clients restoring to a single target client. Applicants agreed to make these additional amendments.

Claims 1 and 13 are amended with the limitation that the restoration is coordinated “...over a plurality of sessions...” Claims 1 and 13 as amended. The amendment is supported by the specification, which discloses multiple sessions. Page 7, lines 155- 157.

Applicants have also amended claims 1 and 13 with the limitation that the master restore table includes “...a status of whether an associated storage media for a data portion has been processed...” Claim 1 as amended. See also claim 13 as amended. The amendment is fully supported by the specification, which teaches the processed status. Page 6, lines 134 – 135, fig. 2, ref. 210.

Claims 1 and 13 are further amended with the limitation that the storage management server blocks access "...by said client systems..." Claims 1 and 13 as amended. The amendment is fully supported by the specification. Page 6, line 137 – page 7, line 140.

Applicants have also amended claims 1 and 13 with the limitations of tracking "...using the status..." and blocking "...in response to a processed status..." Claims 1 and 13 as amended. The amendment is fully supported by the specification, which teaches tracking and blocking using the status. Page 6, line 136 – Page 7, line 140.

Claims 1 and 13 are also amended with the limitation "...wherein the plurality of client systems restore data portions to a single client." Claim 1 and 13 as amended. The amendment is fully supported by the specification. Page 5, line 110 – page 6 line 120.

Applicants have added new claims 21 and 23. The new claims are fully supported by the specification, which discloses the sub-tables. Page 7, lines 141-147. Applicants have also added new claims 22 and 24 that are also supported by the specification, which describes the token. Page 7, line 161 – page 8, line 162.

Response to rejections of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9-13, 15, 16, 19, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Dunham. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 1 and 13 as amended included the limitations that a restoration is coordinated "...over a plurality of sessions..." and of a master restore table comprising "...a status of

whether an associated storage media for a data portion has been processed...” Claims 1 and 13 as amended. Because Dunham does not teach a restoration over a plurality of sessions and a master restore table comprising a status of whether an associated storage media for a data portion has been processed, Applicants submit that claims 1 and 13 are allowable. Applicants further submit that claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 9-12, 15, 16, 19, and 20-24 are allowable as depending from allowable claims.

Response to rejections of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 7 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunham in view of Gamradt. Applicants submit that claims 7 and 17 are allowable as depending from allowable claims.

As a result of the presented remarks, Applicants assert that claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-13, 15-17, 19, and 20-24 are in condition for prompt allowance. Should additional information be required regarding the traversal of the rejections of the claims enumerated above, Examiner is respectfully asked to notify Applicants of such need. If any impediments to the prompt allowance of the claims can be resolved by a telephone conversation, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian C. Kunzler/

Brian C. Kunzler  
Reg. No. 38,527  
Attorney for Applicant

Date: March 6, 2007  
8 East Broadway, Suite 600  
Salt Lake City, UT 84111  
Telephone (801) 994-4646  
Fax (801) 531-1929